13th March 1922]

Higher elementary schools for Muhammadans in Malabar.

1356 Q.—Mr. K. KUNHAMMAD KOYA SAHIB: Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) how many complete higher elementary schools there are in Malabar to meet the special educational needs of the Muhammadan community; and

(b) whether the Government have considered the question of opening higher elementary schools for Mappillas in important Mappilla centres like Angadipuram, Ottapalam, Wandur, Manjeri, Kundotti, Pandikkad and Cheruvadi?

A.—(a) There are five complete higher elementary schools for Mappillas in Malabar and several schools for Mappillas which have the seventh or some lower standard as the highest. In addition, Mappillas are freely admitted into other schools which are not specially intended for them.

(b) The answer is in the negative. The opening of elementary schools is mainly for the consideration of the local bodies concerned.

Enhanced travelling allowances for Sub-Assistant Inspectors of Schools in Malabar.

1357 Q.—Mr. K. KUNHAMMAD KOYA SAHIB: Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether, in view of enhanced scales of travelling allowance having been sanctioned for sub-assistant inspectors of schools in other districts, orders have also been issued increasing the fixed travelling allowances of such officers in Malabar and other special tracts?

A.—The answer is in the negative as the question of treatment of special tracts is still under consideration.

The Madras Excise Licensing Board.

1358 Q.—Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB: Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education (Excise) be pleased to state—

(a) whether any reduction in the number of arrack, toddy and foreign liquor shops has been effected since the Excise Licensing Board came into existence in the Madras City; if so, what the present number is as compared with that in the year when there was no Licensing Board;

(b) whether the Government intend to increase the non-official element on the Madras Excise Licensing Board and thus make it more representative in character;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Board of Revenue vetoed the resolution of the Madras Excise Licensing Board of the 12th January 1921 regarding removal of the *pattai* arrack shop from Tata Muthiappan street, Georgetown, Madras, on the ground that the resolution had not been passed by a two-third majority as required by rule 12 of the rules regulating the constitution and functions of the Board, though five members voted *for* and three *against* it, the total strength being only eight;

(d) whether the resolution of 22nd December 1920 and the resolution of 12th January 1921 can be regarded as resolutions passed within the same year; if not, why a two-third majority was insisted on by the Board of Revenue in the case of the resolution of 12th January 1921 which modified the resolution of 22nd December 1920;